DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 479 CG 008 901

AUTHOR Geist, Glen O.; And Others
TITLE Rehabilitation Counselor Training: An Effort at Evaluation.
PUB DATE [72]
NOTE 26p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Accountability; Career Choice; *Counselor Characteristics; *Counselor Evaluation; *Counselor Training; *Graduate Students; Job Satisfaction; Rehabilitation Counseling; Research Projects

ABSTRACT

With the profession of Rehabilitation Counseling presently focusing on such major issues as ethics, certification and accreditation, accountability becomes the keyword. This study was conducted to meet the accountability issue for one graduate training program. The program was investigated in three different areas of outcome, utilizing a sample of 39 students who had graduated from the program. The three areas entailed general background information on the graduates, their satisfaction with their current employment, and supervisor satisfaction with the graduates' functioning on the job. Discussion of the results center around the areas of attracting and selecting of students, processing students through the program, and the eventual product produced by the program. (Author)

Rehabilitation Counselor Training: An Effort at Evaluation

ED 090479

Glen O. Geist

David B. Hershenson

Marilyn Hafer

Illinois Institute of Technology

CG 008 901

Rehabilitation Counselor Training: An Effort at Evaluation[1]

The profession of Rehabilitation Counseling has been in existence for a number of years. Its increasing significance is evidenced by the number of agencies which employ rehabilitation counselors. For the past 15 years, graduate education in this discipline has been offered and a number of persons have been trained in the profession. At the 1972 National Rehabilitation Association convention, the National Rehabilitation Counseling Association passed a code of ethics. This same organization is working diligently to establish a procedure of certification for rehabilitation counselors which should be fully operative by 1975. Also under development is a process of accreditation for agencies that employ rehabilitation counselors and graduate programs which train them.

The impetus for these actions is the growth of the rehabilitation counseling profession and the concomitant necessity for accountability. The present study was conducted as a beginning step toward meeting the accountability issue for one graduate training program. The purpose of the study was to obtain descriptive data on those graduating from the program; to determine the kinds of work performed after graduation; to determine the graduates' effectiveness as rehabilitation counselors as perceived by themselves and a more objective observer; and to determine how the various aspects of the training program related to job effectiveness. These data were thought to be relevant in evaluating the efficacy of the training program and would be used in making decisions about the structure and administration of the program.

[1]The authors wish to acknowledge the help and contributions of their research assistants, John Tirado and Stuart Zubrick.

METHODOLOGY

Sample

The study was conducted on graduates of the Rehabilitation Counselor Training Program at the Illinois Institute of Technology (IIT). The program was initiated in September, 1966, with a total of 41 graduates between June, 1968 and December, 1971. However, the sample consisted of only 39 graduates as the whereabouts of two were not ascertainable. Data were collected between February and September, 1972.

Instruments

Three mail questionnaires were used in the study. The first phase of the study consisted of the graduates completing a descriptive questionnaire containing the following data: identifying information; family background; data on undergraduate education, the training at IIT, and other graduate education; current employment; other related work experience; and other professional background. This questionnaire was originally designed in 1970 by a group of faculty and doctoral students, of which the senior author was a member, of the Rehabilitation Counselor Training Program at the State University of New York at Buffalo and initially utilized by that program for research on their graduates. Results of their study were presented at the 1972 APGA National Convention in Chicago (Kauppi, 1972). The questionnaire utilized at IIT was a modified version, revised to fit the present situation.

The second phase of the study entailed the completion of a satisfaction questionnaire designed by the authors. It included a rating of the graduates' impressions of both their competence in and preference for various job skills as well as impressions of the adequacy of their training and the mode of training considered most helpful in the acquisition of these job skills.

The completion of a satisfactoriness questionnaire by the graduates' immediate supervisors comprised the final aspect of the research. The supervisors rated the graduates' competence in the same job skills listed in the satisfaction questionnaire, as well as the adequacy of training they perceived the graduates to have received for performing each of the skills.

Procedure

The initial questionnaire was sent to all of the 39 graduates. As soon as a subject completed and returned this, he was sent the satisfaction questionnaire. Upon return of this second questionnaire, the graduates were sent a release of data form along with a sample copy of the satisfactoriness questionnaire. The signed release of data form, a letter describing the research, and a satisfactoriness questionnaire were then sent to the appropriate supervisor by the investigators. The study was conducted in this piecemeal fashion so as not to overburden the subjects at any one time and thereby, hopefully, insure a greater response.

Statistical Analyses

Most of the information provided only descriptive data. Pearson r correlations were run on a few variables.

RESULTS

Sample

Thirty-seven or 94.87% of the subjects responded to the initial questionnaire.

Of these, 34 or 91.89% responded to the satisfaction questionnaire. Thirty-one of these 34 subjects were currently employed and were thus sent the release of data packet. Twenty-five of the 31 graduates or 80.65% returned the release of data form. Two of these indicated that they had no supervisors who were in positions to rate their work. Thus, satisfactoriness questionnaires were sent to 23 supervisors with 21 responding. Nineteen or 48.72% of the total sample (82.61% of the satisfactoriness questionnaires sent) were returned in usable form.

Indentifying Information

The sex of the 37 respondents to the initial questionnaire was evenly divided with 19 males and 18 females. Thirteen were single, 21 married, two divorced and one separated. The age range upon entering the program was between 22 and 50 with the majority in their early twenties. The mean age was 26.89 years with a median age of 24.

Family Background

Information was gathered on fathers' and mothers' educational achievements and occupations. Since many of the mothers' occupations were listed as housewife, social class was determined by the fathers' education and occupation utilizing Hollingshead's Index of Social Position (1957). All five social classes were represented in the sample with most (15) falling in the middle class. The remainder were divided fairly evenly between the two upper (10) and two lower classes (12).

Undergraduate Education

The colleges and universities attended by the subjects for their undergraduate education were rated according to a system devised by Jack Gourman and published in The Gourman Report: Confidential Ratings of American Colleges (1967).

According to the ratings, the majority of subjects (23) graduated from colleges falling within the C range (categorized as fair), three from C- rated colleges, seven from C+ rated colleges and four from B rated colleges. Again, the majority of subjects (27) received undergraduate degrees as psychology majors. The others were spread across education (3), humanities (2), and physical science (3) majors. Twenty received B.A. degrees, 15 received B.S. degrees and one each received a B. Ed. or Ph.B. degree. Two of the subjects received three additional degrees prior to entering the program. One received another B.A. degree in music education and one received both M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in biology. The majority of subjects accumulated an undergraduate GPA of C+ with the mean being 2.91 on a four point system.

Rehabilitation Counselor Education

Twenty of the subjects entered the program immediately upon completing their baccalaureate degrees. The remaining 17 subjects entered the program within 1 to 19 years beyond their baccalaureate with nine doing so within three years. The subjects' GPA in the training program were all within the B range, the majority (25) being between 3.26 and 3.75, with a mean of 3.68. For 36 subjects (excluding one whose graduate GPS was not available), there was a relationship between undergraduate and graduate GPAs ($r=0.34$, $df = 34$, $p < .05$). The number of years elapsed between completing the baccalaureate and admission to the program was not related to graduate GPA ($r=0.06$, $df=34$, $p > .05$).

Thirty-two of the subjects spent four semesters of full-time work in the program with five spending three semesters full-time. Nine subjects spent between one and three semesters of part-time work. All subjects graduated and did so within two and one-half years of entering the program. Thirty-one graduated in the two year scope of the program, four graduated in only one and

one-half years, and two in two and one-half years. All students received at least partial financial support from Rehabilitation Service Administration grants with 32 receiving grants for their first semester in the program, 36 in both the second and third semesters, and 33 in the fourth semester.

A wide variety of agencies (29 in total) were used by the subjects in the field work (practicum and two internships) aspect of the program. The agencies can be categorized as serving client populations designated as emotional handicaps, physical handicaps, public offenders, drug addicts, alcoholics, mentally retarded, blind, poverty, college students and general (caseloads consisting of clients with a wide variety of disabilities and handicaps). A good many graduates (16) obtained their first jobs at agencies in which they performed one of their internships.

The graduates were also asked their reasons for entering the rehabilitation counseling profession and why they specifically chose the program at IIT. The

---

Insert Tables 1 and 2 about here

---

responses are reported in Tables 1 and 2. Some gave more than one reason for each.

Other Graduate Education

Seventeen of the graduates have taken course work beyond the masters degree in Rehabilitation Counseling. Six have studied or are studying in the area of counseling psychology and six in general psychology. One each has studied in the areas of higher education, clinical psychology, counseling and guidance, community psychology and Spanish.

Table 1. Reasons for Choosing Rehabilitation Counseling as a Profession.

Reason	Frequency
Interest in counseling, mental health, and/or field of applied psychology.	23
Financial support during training.	7
Opportunity, freedom, challenge, stimulation of a new profession.	5
Awareness and commitment to the profession - includes having prior experience in the field.	4
For personal and professional growth	4
For the variety within the field.	2
For M.S. - did not differentiate between Rehabilitation and other psychology programs.	1
Thought it was something other than what it turned out to be.	1

Table 2. Reasons for Selecting the Rehabilitation Counselor Program at IIT.

Reason	Frequency
Located in Chicago.	19
Financial support.	17
Recommendation of others, reputation IIT and/or program.	12
Flexibility of curriculum	4
Orientation of program toward therapy.	2
Program included concurrent field experiences.	2
Stepping stone to Ph.D.	2
Only rehabilitation program aware of.	2
Only program applied to.	1
Comprehensive program	1
Originally attracted to another IIT program and transferred.	1
Strength of program director's introductory letter.	1
Faculty showed personal interest.	1
Thought I could get in.	1

One of the seventeen has received the Ph.D. degree. Thirteen expect to receive a Ph.D. degree, one is not certain, and two are not working toward a degree. It is interesting to note that thirteen of these graduates continued their study in a program at IIT while only four have gone elsewhere.

Current Employment

Only three subjects were not working at the time the study was conducted. Of the 34 graduates working, 14 were employed in mental health centers or psychiatric hospitals, two in general hospitals, five in rehabilitation centers, two in correctional centers, eight in colleges (including counseling centers), two in halfway houses and one in an agency for the blind. Twenty-four worked in governmental agencies with three on the federal, 17 on the state and four on the local levels. Ten worked in private organizations.

Job titles varied with most being rehabilitation counselors or counselors (11) and psychologists (9). Five had titles of director, assistant director, graduate assistant or instructors; three were treatment specialist, case aide or trainees; and one was a psychometrist. Twenty-six had full-time jobs while eight worked part-time. Salaries ranged from less than $7,000 to $19,000 with the modal salary range between $9,000 and $11,000.

By far the most popular reason for accepting the current employment was the intrinsic nature of the job, defined as performing counseling and working with people. Most other reasons for accepting employment were the extrinsic nature of the job (freedom, variety, flexibility), opportunity for professional growth, chance to be creative, and salary. The least compelling reasons were the security of the job and geographical location. Twenty-eight of the thirty-

four graduates carried caseloads ranging from less than five to over 40, as part of their job duties. Most (16) worked with a psychiatric clientele.

The results showed that the graduates spent their time performing a diversity of functions. The duty claiming the greatest frequency among the subjects was meetings, followed closely by individual counseling. The functions of inservice training, follow-up, and agency contacts received the least attention, followed closely by the designing of new programs and research. In terms of the time allotted to each job duty, individual counseling absorbed the greatest percentage of time. In second place, but far behind, was group counseling. The least amount of time was spent in being supervised. It is notable that the graduates as a group spend more time in supervising others than they do in being supervised in their job duties. Table 3 gives a complete breakdown of the job duties,

---

Insert Table 3 about here.

---

frequency of graduates performing each, the range of percentage of time spent in each, and the median percentage of time spent in each.

Other Work Experience

Fourteen of the graduates stated that they held other jobs between their graduation from the program and their current employment. Nine had one previous job, four had two previous jobs, and one had five previous jobs. Again, as with the current employment, the reason given most for accepting these positions was the intrinsic nature of the job. This was followed by concerns for salary, work as a professional, opportunity for professional growth, the extrinsic nature of the job and a chance to be creative.

Table 3. Number of Graduates and the Range and Median of Time Percentage Spent in Performing Job Duties.

Job Duties	Frequency of Graduates	% of time spent	
		Range	Median
Individual counseling	27	5-60	30
Group counseling	22	1-30	12
Case recording	17	1-15	5
Research	10	1-100	5
Supervising	19	5-45	7
Being supervised	18	1-20	4
Teaching	15	1-70	5
Consulting	15	1-25	5
Evaluation & Testing	15	1-30	5
Administration	14	1-50	5
Coordinating	21	1-50	10
Meetings	28	1-25	10
Designing programs	9	1-25	9
Clerical tasks	11	1-50	5
Other (inservice training, follow-up, agency contacts)	7	2-75	10

On the other hand, the reason given most for leaving these positions was the intricacies of a bureaucratic system such as red tape, paper work and administrative procedures. This was followed by dissatisfaction with the administration, emphasis on closures and quotas, and lack of promotional opportunities. It is apparent that the graduates are looking for similar kinds of experiences in their selection of each job. Even when they leave jobs for a wide variety of reasons, they continue to select a new job with a consistency of reasons in mind.

Professional Participation

Only 18 of the graduates were members of national professional organizations. Five were members os APGA and the division of ARCA with a few scattered among the other divisions. NRA claimed five of the graduates with NRCA having four on their roles. Four belonged to APA with numerous other organizations mentioned, the most popular being the Association of Humanistic Psychology (3). No graduate has held an office in any of the national organizations.

Considering state and local chapters of the national organizations, only 11 graduates held memberships. Of greater interest is that only two of these indicated holding membership in either state or local rehabilitation counseling associations, although such membership is automatic for NRA and its subdivisions. This says something about the subjects' lack of awareness concerning their professional affiliations. Four of the 11 graduates have held some type of office at state or local levels in related professional organizations. These data would seem to indicate that membership in professional organizations does not necessarily mean active participation.

Satisfaction

A two part questionnaire on satisfaction with the current job and training received from the program was sent to the 37 graduates who returned the

initial questionnaire. Thirty-four responded to this part of the study. Three of the respondents were not currently employed and completed only the satisfaction with training part of the questionnaire. Thus, 31 subjects completed the part of the study having to do with job satisfaction while 34 graduates completed the part having to do with training satisfaction.

Job satisfaction was defined as competence in and preference for performing 23 skills, duties or functions, plus the total job. Almost all (29 of 31) felt they performed their job well, with their greatest expertise in the skill area of individual counseling (28). This was followed in order by the skill areas of coordination of services for individual clients, information giving, intake, case recording and group counseling. All of these areas have been identified by the program and given emphasis during training as being significantly related to the roles and functions of a rehabilitation counselor.

Skills not generally performed by the graduates and not given emphasis in their training are case finding, milieu therapy, administration, and teaching. Three exceptions are research, job development and placement, and evaluation and testing. These are emphasized during training but not generally performed by the graduates on the job. Significant is the fact that of those performing job development and placement, as many dislike these functions as enjoy and tolerate them. Although these have been traditional duties of the rehabilitation counselor, they remain inglorious and distasteful tasks better left to someone else. Other tasks not particularly enjoyed by the graduates are case recording, meetings, clerical tasks and referrals. Mostly these are tolerated as part of the job but not viewed as particularly satisfying. As expected,

everyone performing individual counseling enjoys it, followed by the total job, group counseling, coordination and information giving. Obviously, most of those skills deemed important and given emphasis by the program are shared by the students and remain satisfying aspects of the job.

Training satisfaction was determined by having the subjects rate the adequacy of training and mode of training (courses, field work, or informal interactions) as most helpful in the same 24 skill areas plus three more categories of total training, professional competence and personal growth. By and large, they felt they were adequately trained in most areas. However, they felt they were very well trained in individual counseling, coinciding with their feelings of competence. On the other hand, they rated the skill of consulting as having been poorly trained. The subjects' general reactions to the program were reflected in their responses to the categories of total job and total training, where they felt they were adequately trained as opposed to very well trained. Only one graduate indicated that the program provided poor training for the total job. This may have been a reflection of the job selected (not strictly rehabilitation counseling) rather than the training per se as related to the functioning of a rehabilitation counselor. It is interesting to note that the subjects felt that the training program provided an atmosphere conducive to personal growth and professional competence. Perhaps it is these two intangibles that are important in a graduate program for rehabilitation counselors, enabling the graduating student to adapt, adjust, and learn specific skills related to specific jobs.

For the 31 subjects completing the questionnaire relating to satisfaction with one's own competence and satisfaction with adequacy of training, scores were

summed over all items and averaged by dividing each subject's total score by the number of skills rated (since many subjects indicated they did not perform one or more of the duties listed). The possible range of scores was from 1 to 3, the higher score indicating greater satisfaction with competency and adequacy of training. Analyses of these data yielded a mean score for satisfaction with competence of 2.55; for satisfaction with adequacy of training the mean was 2.14. This suggests that the subjects were more satisfied with their own competence than with the training received. However, a correlation of 0.50 ($df=29$, $p < .01$) was found between scores on these two variables, indicating those who considered themselves more competent in job skills also tended to view their training more favorably. The subjects ranked the modes of training (course work, field work, and informal interactions) most helpful in learning the job skills. The field work experiences of practicum and internship were regarded as being the most helpful in all areas except research, teaching, evaluation and testing, and case finding. In these instances, course work was felt to be the most helpful, except where courses and field work shared the responsibility for acquiring teaching skills. On the other hand, courses ranked last as being helpful in the areas of supervising, being supervised, consulting, coordination, meetings, clerical tasks, milieu therapy, referrals, in-service training, and personal growth. In these latter areas we can see the effects of informal interactions stimulated by the program. These interactions include informal student-student and student-faculty relationships as well as interactions with other professionals both within the confines eatablished by the program and indirectly attributable to being a participant in the program.

Satisfactoriness

Twenty-three satisfactoriness questionnaires were sent to supervisors with 19 returned in usable form. Generally, the supervisors felt that the graduates performed the various functions of their jobs well except in the areas of case

recording, administration and case finding. The supervisors were more or less divided on the areas of teaching, consulting, supervising, evaluation and testing, coordination, community relationships, job development and placement, research, meetings and clerical tasks.

For the most part, supervisors felt the graduates received adequate training. They were very satisfied with the training in individual counseling provided by the program. They were least satisfied with the graduates' training in the areas of teaching, administration and clerical tasks. Admittedly, these functions have received little if any attention in the training program.

By scoring supervisors' ratings of the graduates' competence and adequacy of training in the manner previously described, the mean score for competence was 2.60 (as compared with 2.55 for the subjects own rating of competence) and 2.21 for adequacy of training (as compared with 2.14 for the subjects ratings). No significant correlation was found between the supervisors' ratings of their satisfaction with the graduates' competence and their satisfaction with the training received. This may be due to the limited sample size, since only 19 supervisor ratings were used for this analysis. It appears, however, that both the subjects and supervisors are in agreement that graduates are quite competent in job skills and that graduate training is at least adequate.

Satisfaction vs Satisfactoriness

On the face of it, there appears to be some discrepancy between the supervisors' views and the students' views of the latter's competence in certain job skills. The graduates felt they were very competent in the areas of case recording and coordination, but this view was not held by the supervisors. On the other hand, the graduates did not feel they were as accomplished in meetings, clerical tasks and referrals as did the supervisors. While these discrepancies might be real, they may merely reflect the students' likes or dislikes of certain functions. More likely,

however, the differences can be attributed to 31 graduates responding versus 19 supervisors responding to the same items. When comparing the 19 supervisor responses with the corresponding 19 graduates on competence, an insignificant correlation was computed ($r=0.19$, $df=17$, $p > .05$).

In considering adequacy of training, the supervisors' ratings coincided well with the graduates except for the area of consulting, where the supervisors felt there was better training than did the students. Also, the subjects felt they obtained more personal growth from the training program than did the supervisors. However, this would be especially difficult for a supervisor to rate since it is a very personal and intangible entity, and most supervisors did not see the subjects at the start of the program, before growth took place.

Any differences in the views of adequacy of training might be attributed to a more subjective (graduate) versus a more objective (supervisor) position. More likely, however, the discrepancies are again due to a comparison between 34 subjects and 19 supervisors. (Two supervisors declined to complete the training part of the satisfactoriness questionnaire, but suggested that their ratings of competence might also serve as ratings for adequacy of training. Thus, this analysis included 19 subjects for whom all data were available) No statistically significant relationship was found.

Further analyses of these data included intercorrelations computed on seven variables for the 19 subjects on which all data were collected. Significant correlations were found between the subjects' satisfaction with

competence and satisfaction with training ($r=0.57$, $df=17$, $p<.02$); satisfaction with training and graduate GPA ($r= -0.47$, $df=17$, $p<.05$); and satisfactoriness with training and graduate GPA ($r= -0.55$, $df=17$, $p<.05$). It should be noted that the latter two correlations were negative, indicating that the lower the graduate GPA, the more adequate was the training as viewed by both subjects and supervisors.

While these results suggest that the graduates' personal satisfaction with competence and satisfaction with training are related, neither of these variables were related to supervisors' ratings of competence nor adequacy of training. Again, both subjects' and supervisors' ratings of adequacy of training are negatively related to graduate GPA. However, none of the variables correlated with supervisors' ratings of competence, nor was there any combination of variables which adequately predicted supervisors' scores of competence in a multiple correlation.

DISCUSSION

We are confronted here with a rich vein of data, from which speculations could be mined at great length. For manageability, however, we shall limit ourselves to looking at some of the more interesting (to us) and potentially modifiable points raised when we categorize the data into the three broad areas of input, processing, and product of the training program. Input involves two aspects, attraction and selection of students, with the second of these naturally limited by the first. It is of interest, in Table 1, that most students were attracted primarily by the professional activity of counseling and secondarily by the identity of the rehabilitation counseling profession. Relatively few (7 out of 47, or 15%) reasons of financial support were given for the choice of field, although this reason was given more (17 out of 66, or 26%) for the choice of the

school. In the light of our knowledge of available funded traineeships in rehabilitation counseling and related fields at other local schools during this period, this appears to reflect ignorance of alternatives in those few cases where this was an issue. Traineeships in rehabilitation counseling were initiated to attract students into a new field which lacked visibility. These responses would appear to indicate that, at least to our sample, rehabilitation counseling has achieved visibility as a career in which one can do counseling, rather than as a career in which counseling is among the things done. One may well argue about the desirability of this image for the future of the profession. Nonetheless, there is something positive about the integrity of the profession to be concluded from the fact that so small a percentage of students chose the field because of its supported training and so many chose it for its intrinsic merit.

It is also of interest that only two individuals were attracted to the program by an intent to use it as a stepping stone to a Ph.D., but seven times that number have gone on toward that goal, at least on a part-time basis. It would appear that location of the porgram in a graduate department enculturates formerly naive students to the goal of more and more graduate training. One may wonder whether the faculty, all of whom have Ph.D.s, are by their very existence as models also conveying a message about the negative value of stopping the degree collecting process at the Masters' level. It has yet to be demonstrated that professional competence increases with higher degrees or further formal training beyond a certain point, a message one may convey with no real belief that it will be accepted or acted upon.

As to the issue of selection, it was found that undergraduate grade point average correlated positively with graduate grade point average, which in turn correlated negatively with students' and supervisors' perceptions of adequacy of

training. Perhaps this suggests that by selecting applicants to the program on the basis of their having attained lower undergraduate grades, we will turn out more adequately trained rehabilitation counselors. To the slight extent that intellectually defended or compulsive students tend to do better academically and worse professionally, there is a grain of truth to this paradox.

Or perhaps students with lower undergraduate grades are pressed to attain more in graduate school, both academically and professionally, whereas students with higher undergraduate grades already have the intellectual wherewithal to deal with graduate academics and need to spend more of their time on the professional aspects. Assuming that all the students achieve a relative sameness in terms of competence at the point of graduation, students with lower undergraduate averages would have put more into their graduate programs and gotten more out, with this reflected in their responses of being more satisfied with their training. However, these findings better fit the case we are often called upon to make to the department and school admissions officers, that undergraduate performance is an inaccurate predictor of the end-product we seek to produce, even though it may be a relatively valid predictor of the product our doctoral programs in physiological and experimental psychology are seeking to achieve.

It would appear that the issue of processing our students through the program is confounded at both ends. At entry, most students were attracted by the counseling function, and after graduation, most sought jobs in psychiatrically-oriented settings. It is, therefore, small wonder that most saw individual counseling as the major skill learned (both amount of use and satisfaction) in the program. The location of our program in a psychology department may contribute this bias to some degree, but we have observed the same phenomenon at schools where the rehabilitation counselor training program is located in an education, special

education, or independent department. In developing this counseling skill, emphasis was placed on the greater contribution of fieldwork than of class work. However, without prior class work, field practive would not have been possible. Two of the functions of which the learning was particularly attributed to class-work, research and testing, seem relatively divorced from most students' post-graduation job experiences, which raises questions as to whether these areas (both of which share a basis in quantification) are overemphasized or treated too lightly in the course of the program.

Surprisingly, of those engaged in evaluation and testing functions, not one dislikes them. Perhaps these are negotiable functions in a job description and those counselors who select to perform them are those who derive a modicum of pleasure from the tasks. Since research is one focus of training with a great majority of graduates claiming at least adequate training, the fact that so few perform this function on the job may indicate a feeling on the part of the hiring agencies that research is not a necessary job function or is better left to another discipline. Perhaps if testing and research were stressed even more in training, these areas would be carried over into postgraduation practice to a greater degree.

There seems to be somewhat of a "looking glass self" phenomenon present in the correlation between graduates' perception of the adequacy of their training and their ratings of their own competence, in that each reflects the image of the other. Similarly, it would appear that most of the activities at which the graduates perceive themselves as particularly functional <u>on the job</u> (individual and group counseling, coordinating, information-giving and in-service training, all of which were top-rated by over half the group as to both competence and enjoyment) were perceived as having been learned primarily in field work by the majority of

the group. Thus, fieldwork learning during training and field practice after graduation may similarly feed into each other in the attribution of source and degree of competence.

As to the product of the program, we were frankly disappointed with the low level of graduate identification with and participation in professional organizations. Members of the faculty have been active in these areas and have encouraged student involvement. On the other hand, the almost equal spread of that participation which does exist across APA, APGA, and NRA may speak to the lack of a strong, clearly identified professional organization for rehabilitation counselors until quite recently. Perhaps as certification becomes a reality, professional activity will expand and a single organizational focus for it will emerge.

We have begun to introduce changes in our training program on the basis of conclusions drawn from this study. Among these changes are the introduction of a course in supervision for second year students, to provide a skill which many graduates report being called upon to perform but for which few feel prepared. Students are being more actively encouraged to develop identification with and participation in professional organizations in rehabilitation counseling, to address the issue discussed above. Emphases of contents in courses have been re-evaluated in the light of feedback as to their utility contained in this study.

However, we are aware that the role of the rehabilitation counselor is still in flux, the job market for our graduates is changing, and societal demands for these services are often apparently capricious. We do not wish to foreclose the identity options of our graduates at this point in history, lest they become maladapted casualties in the process of professional evolution. Therefore, we cannot use the feedback of the past half decade to determine rigidly the exact directions for the next half decade. We can, however, offer an approach to self-

evaluation and self-renewal which will probably be more perfectable as to its method than as to its conclusions. We welcome and offer to assist parallel or complementary studies by other rehabilitation counselor training programs in the hope that we can together arrive at some conclusions of sufficient generality to improve the state of our art.

References

Gourman, J. The Gourman Report: Confidential Ratings of American of American Colleges. Phoenix: The Continuing Education Institute, Inc., 1967.

Hollingshead A. B. Two Factor Index of Social Position. 1965 Yale Station, New Haven, Connecticut, 1957.

Kauppi, D. R. Chairman, "Rehabilitation Counselor Education: Training for Involvement?" State University of New York at Buffalo, Program presented at the 1972 American Personnel and Guidance Association National Convention, Chicago, 1972.